arXiv:1406.7683v1 [math.DS] 30 Jun 2014

ON POLYNOMIAL SUBMERSIONS OF DEGREE 4 AND THE REAL JACOBIAN CONJECTURE IN $\mathbb{R}^2$

FRANCISCO BRAUN AND BRUNA ORÉFICE-OKAMOTO

Abstract. The main result of this paper is the following version of the real Jacobian conjecture: "Let $F = (p, q) : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polynomial map with nowhere zero Jacobian determinant. If the degree of p is less than or equal to 4, then F is injective". Assume that two polynomial maps from $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{R}$ are equivalent when they are the same up to affine changes of coordinates in the source and in the target. We completely classify the polynomial submersions of degree 4 with at least one disconnected level set up to this equivalence, obtaining four classes. Then, analysing the half-Reeb components of the foliation induced by a representative p of each of these classes, we prove there is not a polynomial q such that the Jacobian determinant of the map (p, q) is nowhere zero. Recalling that the real Jacobian conjecture is true for maps $F = (p, q)$ when all the level sets of p are connected, we conclude the proof of the main result.

1. Introduction

Let $F = (p, q) : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polynomial map such that its Jacobian determinant, $\det DF$, is nowhere zero in $\mathbb{R}^2$. By the inverse function theorem, F is locally injective. The *real Jacobian conjecture* asserts that F is globally injective. This is closely related to the famous *Jacobian conjecture*, which claims that given K a field of characteristic zero, any polynomial map from K^n to K^n such that its Jacobian determinant is equal to 1 is injective. Jacobian conjecture was stated at the first time in 1939 by Keller ([9]) and up to now is open if $n \geq 2$. We refer to [6] for further informations on Jacobian conjecture.

The real Jacobian conjecture is nevertheless not true: in 1994, Pinchuk constructed, in [10], a non injective polynomial map $F = (p, q)$ such that $\det DF \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. In this example, the polynomials p and q have high degrees: p has degree 10 and q has degree 40. Since the injectivity of F is clear when the degree of F is one (in this case F is an affine change of coordinates), it is natural to ask what would be the highest degree of p or q guaranteeing the global injectivity of F.

In this direction, Gwoździewicz proved, in [8], that if the degrees of p and q are less than or equal to 3 then F is injective. In [2], Braun and Santos generalized Gwoździewicz result proving that the injectivity of F is true provided just the degree of p being less than or equal to 3. Thus a natural question is: what is the maximum degree of p, between 3 and 9, in order that the injectivity of F is

Date: May 5, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 14R15; Secondary: 26C10, 53C12.

Key words and phrases. Real Jacobian conjecture, global injectivity, positive polynomials, half-Reeb components.

The second author was partially supported by FAPESP grants 2011/08877-3 and 2013/14014-3.

This paper is in final form and no version of it will be submitted for publication elsewhere.

necessary independently of the degree of q? As a partial answer to this question, we prove in this note the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $F = (p, q) : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polynomial map such that $\det DF \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. If the degree of p is less than or equal to 4, then F is injective.*

Since the assumption "$\det DF \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$" gives that q is strictly monotone along each connected component of a level set of p (as the level sets of q are transversal to the level sets of p), one strategy to show the injectivity of F is to prove that the level sets of p are all connected. Actually, since injective polynomial maps are bijections (see [3]), this is also necessary to the injectivity of F. Thus to prove Theorem 1.1 it is enough to consider all the polynomial submersions p with disconnected level sets and to show that for these there is not a polynomial q such that $\det DF \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Before continuing, we need the following definition.

Definition 1.2. We say that two functions $p, q : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ are *equivalent* if there exist an affine change of coordinates[1] $T : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ and constants $M, N \in \mathbb{R}$, with $M \neq 0$, such that $p(x, y) = Mq \circ T^{-1}(x, y) + N$.

Let p be a polynomial submersion. It is quite simple to show that all its level sets are connected if the degree of p is less than or equal to 2. If p has degree 3 and has at least one disconnected level set, one of the results of the above cited paper [2] shows that p is equivalent to $y + xy^2$. In our next theorem, we give the classification in the case of degree 4.

Theorem 1.3. *If $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a polynomial submersion of degree 4 which has at least one disconnected level set, then p is equivalent to one of the following*

(1) $p(x, y) = y + xy^2 + y^4$,
(2) $p(x, y) = y + a_{02}y^2 + xy^3$, *with* $a_{02} = 0$ *or* 1,
(3) $p(x, y) = y + x^2y^2$,
(4) $p(x, y) = y + a_{02}y^2 + y^3 + x^2y^2$, *with* $a_{02}^2 - 3 < 0$.

For each case of Theorem 1.3, we will prove there is no polynomial q such that $\det D(p, q)$ is nowhere zero. As a consequence, we will obtain Theorem 1.1, since when the degree of p is less than or equal to 3, the injectivity was already proven in [2] (in that paper, it was also shown there is no q such that $\det D(y + xy^2, q)$ is nowhere zero).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we use subresultants of two polynomials to develop results to decide when two special polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[x, y]$ have common zeros. These special polynomials have the form of $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$, where p is a polynomials of degree 4. In Section 3, we construct results to decide when a special polynomial submersion has all its level sets connected. Then in Section 4, we use the results of sections 2 and 3 to prove Theorem 1.3.

In Section 5, we will consider the polynomials of Theorem 1.3 and prove that for each of them there is not a polynomial $q(x, y)$ such that $\det D(p, q)(x, y) > 0$, for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For the arguments we shall use the concept of half-Reeb component of a foliation. Then, in Section 6, we depicted the proof of Theorem 1.1.

---

[1] By affine change of coordinates we mean a map of the form $\begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} e \\ f \end{pmatrix}$, where $a, b, c, d, e, f \in \mathbb{R}$, with $ad - bc \neq 0$.

The arguments in Section 5 are divided in two groups. In the first one, we study the polynomials 1 and 2 of Theorem 1.3 and use techniques analogous to [2] to conclude the non existence of a polynomial q. Now in the second group, when we analyse the polynomial 3 and 4, these techniques no longer work. Thus we transform part of the problem in being able to decide when a special polynomial of one variable is positive. Namely, Lemma 5.6 asserts that $L(\theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} b_j\big(2(j+1)\theta + 2j + 1\big)\theta^j$ can not be a positive polynomial, if not identically zero. The proof of this lemma is in the Appendix.

2. Common zeros of polynomials

Let us recall the concept of subresultants of polynomials. Consider two polynomials $p(x), q(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$,

$$p(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0,$$
$$q(x) = b_m x^m + b_{m-1}x^{m-1} + \cdots + b_0,$$

and take their Sylvester matrix written in the following form

$$Syl(p,q,x) = \begin{pmatrix} a_n & a_{n-1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_0 & & & \\ & a_n & a_{n-1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & & \ddots & \\ & & & a_n & a_{n-1} & \cdots & \cdots & a_0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ & & & \iddots & \iddots & & \iddots & \\ & b_m & b_{m-1} & \cdots & \cdots & b_0 & & \\ b_m & b_{m-1} & \cdots & \cdots & b_0 & & & \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} \left.\vphantom{\begin{matrix}a\\a\\a\\a\\a\\a\\a\\a\end{matrix}}\right\} m \text{ rows} \\ \\ \left.\vphantom{\begin{matrix}a\\a\\a\\a\\a\\a\\a\\a\end{matrix}}\right\} n \text{ rows} \end{matrix}.$$

For each $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, [(n+m)/2]\}$, we define the *k-subresultant* of p and q, $R_k(p,q,x)$, by the determinant of the $(n+m-2k)\times(n+m-2k)$ matrix obtained when we delete the first and the latest k columns and rows of $Syl(p,q,x)$. The following result is classical but we include a proof of it for the sake of completeness. Our proof was based on [1].

Lemma 2.1. *Consider $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ as above, with $a_n b_m \neq 0$. Then p and q have exactly k common roots (counting multiplicity) if and only if*

$$R_0(p,q,x) = \cdots = R_{k-1}(p,q,x) = 0, \qquad R_k(p,q,x) \neq 0.$$

Proof. Let us denote by C_j the jth column of $Syl(p,q,x)$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m+n$. By substituting the last column C_{m+n} by $C_{m+n} + \sum_{k=1}^{m+n-1} y^{m+n-k}C_k$, and calculating the determinant using the Laplace expansion on the last column, we get that $R_0(p,q,x) = f(y)p(y) + g(y)q(y)$, where f and g are polynomials of degree less than or equal to $m-1$ and $n-1$, respectively. Since $R_0(p,q,x)$ is a complex number with does not depend on y, it follows that p and q have a common root if and only if $R_0(p,q,x) = 0$.

Now the lemma follows readily from the following assertion: *If $p(x) = (x-\alpha)p_1(x)$ and $q(x) = (x-\alpha)q_1(x)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, then $R_i(p_1,q_1,x) = R_{i+1}(p,q,x)$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots$.* To prove the assertion, we make the following operations on the columns of $Syl(p_1,q_1,x)$: we change column C_i by $C_i - \alpha C_{i-1}$ for $i = m+n-2, m+n-3, \ldots, 2$. Then we observe this is exactly the matrix $Syl(p,q,x)$ without the first and the last rows and columns. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $a, b, c, d, e : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be functions. For*

$$p(x,y) = y^2 + a(x)y + b(x), \qquad q(x,y) = y^2 + c(x)y + d(x),$$

we have the following formulas

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(p,q,y) =& c - a, \\ R_0(p,q,y) =& -(d-b)^2 + \big(a(d-b) - bR_1\big)R_1. \end{aligned}$$

Whereas for

$$p(x,y) = y^2 + a(x)y + b(x), \qquad q(x,y) = y^3 + c(x)y^2 + d(x)y + e(x),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(p,q,y) =& a^2 - ac - b + d, \\ R_0(p,q,y) =& -(ab - bc + e)^2 + \big(a(ab - bc + e) - bR_1\big)R_1. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f, g, h, A, B : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be smooth functions, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that $h(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $A(\alpha)^2 - 4B(\alpha) < 0$. Define*

$$R(x) = h(x)\Big(- f(x)^2 + \big(A(x)f(x) - B(x)g(x)\big)g(x)\Big).$$

If there is a non negative integer i such that $R^{(0)}(\alpha) = R^{(1)}(\alpha) = \cdots = R^{(2i)}(\alpha) = 0$, then $R^{(2i+1)}(\alpha) = 0$.[2]

Proof. In order to simplify the notation, we denote $A = A(\alpha)$, $B = B(\alpha)$, $f^{(j)} = f^{(j)}(\alpha)$, $g^{(j)} = g^{(j)}(\alpha)$ and $h^{(j)} = h^{(j)}(\alpha)$.

We will first make the proof supposing $h \equiv 1$. If $R(\alpha) = 0$, we have

$$0 = -f^2 + (Af - Bg)\, g = -\left(f^2 - Agf + Bg^2\right),$$

which only can be true if $(Ag)^2 - 4Bg^2 \geq 0$. Since by hypothesis $A^2 - 4B < 0$, we obtain $g = 0$ and thus $f = 0$. This implies by Leibniz rule that

$$R'(\alpha) = -2ff' + (Af - Bg)'\, g + (Af - Bg)\, g' = 0,$$

showing the result for $i = 0$. Let us make the following induction hypothesis:

$$\text{The result is true for } i-1, \text{ and for each } k \leq i-1,\ f^{(k)} = g^{(k)} = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

We will show this is true for i. Then the first part of the proof will be completed. Leibniz rule gives

$$R^{(2i)}(\alpha) = -\sum_{k=0}^{2i} \binom{2i}{k} \left(f^{(k)} f^{(2i-k)} - (Af - Bg)^{(k)}\, g^{(2i-k)}\right).$$

By (2.1), if $k \leq i-1$, $f^{(k)} = g^{(k)} = 0$, hence $(Af - Bg)^{(k)} = 0$ and $(Af - Bg)^{(i)} = Af^{(i)} - Bg^{(i)}$ (apply Leibniz rule). Now if $k \geq i+1$, $f^{(2i-k)} = g^{(2i-k)} = 0$, since $2i - k \leq i - 1$. Then last sum simplifies to

$$R^{(2i)}(\alpha) = -\binom{2i}{i}\left((f^{(i)})^2 - Ag^{(i)}f^{(i)} + B(g^{(i)})^2\right).$$

[2]Here $R^{(j)}$ stands for the jth derivative of R.

If $R^{(2i)}(\alpha)=0$, we have to have $(Ag^{(i)})^2-4B(g^{(i)})^2\geq 0$, which by hypothesis gives $g^{(i)}=0$, hence $f^{(i)}=0$. Now it remains to prove that $R^{(2i+1)}(\alpha)=0$. Apply again Leibniz rule to obtain

$$R^{(2i+1)}(\alpha)=-\sum_{k=0}^{2i+1}\binom{2i+1}{k}\left(f^{(k)}f^{(2i+1-k)}-(Af-Bg)^{(k)}\,g^{(2i+1-k)}\right).$$

If $k\leq i$, $f^{(k)}=0$ and $(Af-Bg)^{(k)}=0$. If $k>i$, $2i+1-k<i+1$, and it follows that $f^{(2i+1-k)}=g^{(2i+1-k)}=0$. This gives us $R^{(2i+1)}(\alpha)=0$.

In the general case, we define $\overline{R}(x)=R(x)/h(x)$. Leibniz rule gives for $l=0,1,2\ldots$

$$\overline{R}^{(l)}=\sum_{k=0}^{l}\binom{l}{k}R^{(k)}\,(1/h)^{(l-k)}.$$

Then the hypothesis $R^{(0)}(\alpha)=\cdots=R^{(2i)}(\alpha)=0$ shows $\overline{R}^{(0)}(\alpha)=\cdots=\overline{R}^{(2i)}(\alpha)=0$. Thus by the first part of the proof we obtain $\overline{R}^{(2i+1)}(\alpha)=0$. Hence, putting $l=2i+1$ above, we conclude $R^{(2i+1)}(\alpha)=0$. □

Now we apply the preceding results to produce criteria to decide when two special polynomials have common zeros.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $p(x,y)$ and $q(x,y)$ in $\mathbb{R}[x,y]$ as follows*

$$p(x,y)=M(x)y^2+a(x)y+b(x),\qquad q(x,y)=N(x)y^3+c(x)y^2+d(x)y+e(x).$$

Write $R_0(x)=R_0(p,q,y)=b_0+b_1x+\cdots+b_lx^l$. If

1. *$R_0(x)$ has no common zeros with $N(x)$,*
2. *there exists $z\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $b_lR_0(z)<0$,*

then there exists $(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $p(\alpha,\beta)=q(\alpha,\beta)=0$.

Proof. Let $\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k$ be the distinct real zeros of $R_0(x)$ (by 2 we have at least one).

If $M(\alpha_i)=0$, for some $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$, we have two possibilities:

$$a(\alpha_i)\neq 0\qquad\text{or}\qquad a(\alpha_i)=0.$$

In the first one, define $\overline{p}(y)=p(\alpha_i,y)$ and $\overline{q}(y)=q(\alpha_i,y)$, and observe that $R_0(\overline{p},\overline{q},y)=R_0(\alpha_i)/N(\alpha_i)=0$, and $R_1(\overline{p},\overline{q},y)=a(\alpha_i)^2$. Thus by Lemma 2.1 there is exactly one $\beta\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\alpha_i,\beta)=q(\alpha_i,\beta)=0$ (since the coefficients of $\overline{p}$ and $\overline{q}$ are real). On the other hand, if $a(\alpha_i)=0$, it is simple to see that $R_0(\alpha_i)=N(\alpha_i)^2b(\alpha_i)^3$. Thus $b(\alpha_i)=0$, hence $p(\alpha_i,y)\equiv 0$. Moreover, there exists $\beta\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $q(\alpha_i,\beta)=0$, since $q(\alpha_i,y)$ is a polynomial of degree 3 in y.

From now on, we will suppose $M(\alpha_i)\neq 0$, for all $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$. Denoting $R_1(x)=R_1(p,q,y)$, if $R_1(\alpha_i)\neq 0$ for some $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$, Lemma 2.1 shows the existence of $\beta\in\mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\alpha_i,\beta)=q(\alpha_i,\beta)=0$ as we wanted.

Thus we suppose $R_1(\alpha_i)=0$ for each $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$. *We assert there is $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$ such that $a(\alpha_i)^2-4M(\alpha_i)b(\alpha_i)\geq 0$.* In this case, since by Lemma 2.1 $p(\alpha_i,y)$ and $q(\alpha_i,y)$ have exactly two zeros in common (observe $R_2(p,q,y)(\alpha_i)=M(\alpha_i)\neq 0$), they must be real zeros and we are done.

Let us then prove the assertion. Suppose by contradiction that for all $i\in\{1,\ldots,k\}$, $a(\alpha_i)^2-4M(\alpha_i)b(\alpha_i)<0$. By definition of subresultant and by Lemma 2.2, we have in a neighborhood of each α_i where $M(x)N(x)\neq 0$,

$$R_0(p,q,y)=M^3N^2R_0\left(p/M,q/N,y\right)=M^3N^2\left(-f^2+(Af-Bg)g\right),\tag{2.2}$$

where we have written $A = a/M$, $B = b/M$, $f = ab/M^2 - bc/(MN) + e/N$ and $g = R_1(p/M, q/N, y)$. Then by Lemma 2.3, since $a^2 - 4Mb < 0$ if and only if $A^2 - 4B < 0$, we obtain that each α_i is a zero of multiplicity even of $R_0(x)$, say m_i. Then

$$R_0(x) = b_l(x - \alpha_1)^{m_1} \cdots (x - \alpha_k)^{m_k} r(x),$$

where $r(x)$ is a monic polynomial without real zeros. Thus $b_l R_0(x) \geq 0$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, a contradiction with assumption 2. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let $p(x, y)$ and $q(x, y)$ in $\mathbb{R}[x, y]$ be defined by*

$$p(x, y) = M(x)y^2 + a(x)y + b(x), \qquad q(x, y) = N(x)y^2 + c(x)y + d(x).$$

Write $R_0(x) = R_0(p, q, y) = b_0 + b_1 x + \cdots + b_l x^l$. If

(1) *$R_0(x)$ has no common zeros with $M(x)$ and $N(x)$,*
(2) *there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $b_l R_0(z) < 0$,*

then there exists $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $p(\alpha, \beta) = q(\alpha, \beta) = 0$.

Moreover, if we keep other hypotheses and change 1 by

(i′) *$R_0(x)$ has no common zeros with $N(x)$ and there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $R_0(\alpha) = M(\alpha) = 0$,*

then there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\alpha, \beta) = q(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ if and only if $a(\alpha) \neq 0$ or $p(\alpha, y) \equiv 0$ and $c(\alpha)^2 - 4N(\alpha)d(\alpha) \geq 0$.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.4, let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ be the distinct real zeros of $R_0(x)$.

If $M(\alpha_i) = 0$ for some i, and $a(\alpha_i) \neq 0$, take $\overline{p}(y) = p(\alpha_i, y)$ and $\overline{q}(y) = q(\alpha_i, y)$, and observe that $R_0(\overline{p}, \overline{q}, y) = R_0(\alpha_i)/N(\alpha_i) = 0$. Since $R_1(\overline{p}, \overline{q}, y) = a(\alpha_i)$, we have by Lemma 2.1 that there is $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\alpha_i, \beta) = q(\alpha_i, \beta) = 0$. If now $a(\alpha_i) = 0$, $R_0(\alpha_i) = N(\alpha_i)^2 b(\alpha_i)^2$, hence $b(\alpha_i) = 0$. Thus $p(\alpha_i, y) \equiv 0$, and $q(\alpha_i, y) = 0$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if $c(\alpha_i)^2 - 4N(\alpha_i)d(\alpha_i) \geq 0$. This proves the second part of the theorem.

We suppose now that $M(\alpha_i) \neq 0$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. The proof from now on is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.4. If $R_1(\alpha_i) \neq 0$ for some i, we are done. If $R_1(\alpha_i) = 0$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$, *we assert there is i such that* $a(\alpha_i)^2 - 4M(\alpha_i)b(\alpha_i) \geq 0$. If this is in force, since $p(\alpha_i, y)$ and $q(\alpha_i, y)$ have two zeros in common, they must be real.

Thus let us prove the assertion. Suppose $a(\alpha_i)^2 - 4M(\alpha_i)b(\alpha_i) < 0$, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$. By Lemma 2.2 and definition of resultant, we get in a small neighbourhood of each α_i

$$R_0(p, q, y) = M^2 N^2 \left(-f^2 + (Af - Bg)g\right), \tag{2.3}$$

where $A = a/M$, $B = b/M$, $f = d/N - b/M$ and $g = R_1(p/M, q/N, y)$. Then by Lemma 2.3, we have that all the zeros of $R_0(x)$ have multiplicity even m_i. Thus

$$R_0(x) = b_l(x - \alpha_1)^{m_1} \cdots (x - \alpha_k)^{m_k} r(x),$$

where $r(x)$ is a monic polynomial without real zeros. This gives $b_l R_0(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, a contradiction with hypothesis 2. □

The following two corollaries use the 1-subresultant to analyse common zeros of polynomials when hypotheses 2 of the preceding theorems are difficult to be verified.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $p(x,y)$ and $q(x,y)$ as in Theorem 2.4. If*

(1) *$R_0(x)$ has no common zeros with $N(x)$,*
(2) *there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $R_1(z) = 0$, $b_l M(z) > 0$ and $N(z) \neq 0$,*

then there exists $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $p(\alpha, \beta) = q(\alpha, \beta) = 0$.

Proof. Since $M(z)N(z) \neq 0$, in a neighborhood of z we have, as in (2.2),

$$R_0(x) = R_0(p, q, y) = N^2 M^3 \left(-f^2 + (Af - Bg)g\right), \tag{2.4}$$

If $f(z) \neq 0$, then $b_l R_0(z) = -N(z)^2 M(z)^2 f(z)^2 b_l M(z) < 0$ (recall that $g = R_1(p/M, q/N, y)$), and thus the result follows from Theorem 2.4.

If, on the other hand, $f(z) = 0$, we have $R_0(z) = R_1(z) = 0$, which guarantees two common zeros of $p(z,y)$ and $q(z,y)$. If these zeros are real we are done.

Thus let us suppose $a(z)^2 - 4M(z)b(z) < 0$. If $g \equiv 0$, since the zeros of f are isolated (it is a rational function not identically zero, since if $f \equiv 0$, $R_0 \equiv 0$ by (2.4), hence $b_l = 0$, a contradiction with 2), we have by (2.4) for $x \neq z$ near z

$$b_l R_0(x) = -N(x)^2 M(x)^2 f(x)^2 b_l M(x) < 0,$$

and we are under the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4. Now if $g \not\equiv 0$, we have $g(x) \neq 0$ and $a(x)^2 - 4M(x)b(x) < 0$ for $x \neq z$ near z. This gives $\left(A(x)g(x)\right)^2 - 4B(x)g(x)^2 < 0$ which guarantees $-f(x)^2 + A(x)g(x)f(x) - B(x)g(x)^2 < 0$ for $x \neq z$ near z. This together with (2.4) and assumption (2) gives

$$b_l R_0(x) = N(x)^2 M(x)^2 b_l M(x) \left(-f(x)^2 + A(x)g(x)f(x) - B(x)g(x)^2\right) < 0,$$

for $x \neq z$ near z, and we are again under the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4. □

Corollary 2.7. *Let $p(x,y)$ and $q(x,y)$ as in Theorem 2.5. If*

(1) *$R_0(x)$ has no common zeros with $M(x)$ and $N(x)$,*
(2) *$b_l > 0$ and there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $R_1(z) = 0$ and $M(z)N(z) \neq 0$,*

then there exists $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $p(\alpha, \beta) = q(\alpha, \beta) = 0$.

Moreover, if we keep other hypotheses and change 1 by

(i′) *$R_0(x)$ has no common zeros with $N(x)$ and there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $R_0(\alpha) = M(\alpha) = 0$,*

then there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(\alpha, \beta) = q(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ if and only if $a(\alpha) \neq 0$ or $p(\alpha, y) \equiv 0$ and $c(\alpha)^2 - 4N(\alpha)d(\alpha) \geq 0$.

Proof. The second part of the corollary is clearly similar to the second part of Theorem 2.5. Thus suppose we are under hypothesis 1 and 2.

Since $M(z)N(z) \neq 0$, in a neighborhood of z we have, as in equation (2.3),

$$R_0(p, q, y) = N^2 M^2 \left(-f^2 + (Af - Bg)g\right). \tag{2.5}$$

If $f(z) \neq 0$, we have $b_l R_0(z) = -N(z)^2 M(z)^2 f(z)^2 b_l < 0$, hence we are under the hypotheses of Theorem 2.5.

If, on the other hand, $f(z) = 0$, we have $R_0(z) = R_1(z) = 0$, which guarantees two common zeros of $p(z,y)$ and $q(z,y)$. If these zeros are real we are done. Thus let us suppose $a(z)^2 - 4M(z)b(z) < 0$. If $g \equiv 0$, since the zeros of f are isolated (as in the proof of Corollary 2.6), we have $b_l R_0(x) = -N(x)^2 M(x)^2 f(x)^2 b_l < 0$ for $x \neq z$ near z, and we are again under the hypotheses of Theorem 2.5. Now if $g \not\equiv 0$, we have $g(x) \neq 0$ and $a(x)^2 - 4M(x)b(x) < 0$ for $x \neq z$ near z. This gives

$(A(x)g(x))^2 - 4B(x)g(x)^2 < 0$ and thus $-f(x)^2 + A(x)g(x)f(x) - B(x)g(x)^2 < 0$ for $x \neq z$ near z. This together with (2.5) and assumption 2 gives

$$b_l R_0(x) = N(x)^2 M(x)^2 b_l \left(-f(x)^2 + A(x)g(x)f(x) - B(x)g(x)^2\right) < 0,$$

for $x \neq z$ near z, and we are also under hypotheses of Theorem 2.5. □

3. Level sets

Lemma 3.1. *Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open set. If $p : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth submersion then the connected components of the level sets of p induce a smooth foliation of dimension 1 of M.*

Proof. See, for example, [4]. □

In particular, when $M = \mathbb{R}^2$, any connected component of a level set of f is an unbounded curve in both directions.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $p(x, y) = a_n(y)x^n + \cdots + a_0(y)$ be a smooth function. Then for each interval $[c, d] \subset \{y \in \mathbb{R} \mid a_n(y) \neq 0\}$, there exists an interval $[a, b]$ such that*

$$\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in [c, d],\ p(x, y) = 0\} \subset [a, b] \times [c, d].$$

Proof. Define

$$A_i = \sup_{y \in [c,d]} \left| \frac{a_i(y)}{a_n(y)} \right|,\ i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1, \qquad B = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (nA_{n-k})^{1/k}.$$

If $y \in [c, d]$ and $|x| > B$, then

$$p(x, y) = a_n(y)x^n \left(1 + \frac{a_{n-1}(y)}{a_n(y)}\frac{1}{x} + \cdots + \frac{a_0(y)}{a_n(y)}\frac{1}{x^n}\right) \neq 0.$$

Taking $[a, b] = [-B, B]$, the lemma follows. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth submersion with the expression*

$$p(x, y) = A(y)x^2 + B(y)x + C(y).$$

If

(1) $A(y) \neq 0$, $\forall y \in \mathbb{R}$,
(2) $\Delta(y) = B(y)^2 - 4A(y)C(y)$ *is a* polynomial *with* odd *degree,*

then $p^{-1}\{0\}$ is connected.

Proof. We suppose that the leader coefficient of $\Delta(y)$ is positive. The proof in the other case is analogous. Therefore there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Delta(c) = 0$ and $\Delta(y) < 0$, $\forall y < c$. In particular, $p^{-1}\{0\} \subset \mathbb{R} \times [c, \infty)$ and there exists exactly one $x_c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(x_c, c) = 0$. Let Γ be the connected component of $p^{-1}\{0\}$ which contains (x_c, c) and consider $Q = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathbb{R} \times (c, \infty)$ such that $p(Q) = 0$. It is clearly enough to prove that $Q \in \Gamma$.

By Lemma 3.2, there exists an interval $[a, b]$ such that

$$p^{-1}\{0\} \cap (\mathbb{R} \times [c, q_2]) \subset (a, b) \times [c, q_2]. \tag{3.1}$$

Now by Lemma 3.1, both ends of Γ must escape the compact $[a, b] \times [c, q_2]$. Therefore, by (3.1), Γ will cut the line $\mathbb{R} \times \{q_2\}$ in two points, say (x_1, q_2) and (x_2, q_2). Since Γ does not have self intersections, $x_1 \neq x_2$. In particular $\Delta(q_2) > 0$ and $q_1 \in \{x_1, x_2\}$, hence $Q \in \Gamma$. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be the smooth submersion*

$$p(x, y) = A(y)x^2 + B(y)x + C(y).$$

If

(1) *$A(y) = 0$ for exactly one $y \in \mathbb{R}$,*
(2) *When $A(y) = 0$, there exists exactly one $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $p(x, y) = 0$,*
(3) *$\Delta(y) = B(y)^2 - 4A(y)C(y)$ is a* polynomial *with* even *degree and its leader coefficient is* negative,

then $p^{-1}\{0\}$ is connected.

Proof. Let $y_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A(y_1) = 0$. By item 3, there exist $y_0, y_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, with $y_0 < y_1 < y_3$, such that if $y \leq y_0$ or if $y \geq y_3$, $\Delta(y) < 0$. Hence

$$p^{-1}\{0\} \subset \mathbb{R} \times (y_0, y_3). \tag{3.2}$$

By item 2, there exists exactly one point P in the line $\mathbb{R} \times \{y_1\}$ such that $p(P) = 0$. Let Γ be the connected component of $p^{-1}\{0\}$ which contains P.

We assert that Γ can not be entirely contained in $\mathbb{R} \times (y_0, y_1]$ nor in $\mathbb{R} \times [y_1, y_3)$. Indeed, if $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R} \times [y_1, y_3)$, then there exists $y_2 > y_1$ such that (using lemmas 3.2 and 3.1) there exist four different solutions of $p(x, y_2) = 0$, a contradiction since this is a quadratic equation in x. Similar contradiction can be obtained if we suppose $\Gamma \subset (y_0, y_1]$.

Now take $Q = (\overline{x}, \overline{y}) \in \mathbb{R} \times [y_1, y_3]$ such that $p(Q) = 0$. We will prove that $Q \in \Gamma$. In fact, by the assertion above, there exists $(x_2, y_2) \in \Gamma$ with $y_1 < y_2 < \overline{y}$. Thus by Lemma 3.2, there exists an interval $[a, b]$ such that $p^{-1}\{0\} \cap (\mathbb{R} \times [y_2, y_3]) \subset [a, b] \times [y_2, y_3]$. Then by (3.2) and Lemma 3.1, the connected component of $p^{-1}\{0\}$ which contains Q must cut the line $\mathbb{R} \times \{y_2\}$ in two different points. Since $p(x, y_2) = 0$ is a quadratic equation in x, one of these points must be (x_2, y_2), and then $Q \in \Gamma$.

The same can be done if we take $Q \in \mathbb{R} \times [y_0, y_1]$ such that $p(Q) = 0$. Thus $p^{-1}\{0\}$ is connected. □

To prove propositions 3.3 and 3.4, we used the properties of the discriminant of a quadratic equation. For the next proposition, which already appeared in [2], let us recall the properties of the discriminant of a cubic equation

$$x^3 + Ax^2 + Bx + C = 0.$$

Take $P = B - A^2/3$ and $Q = C - AB/3 + 2A^3/27$, and define the *discriminant* of the above equation by $D = Q^2/4 + P^3/27$. We have that

if $D < 0$, the equation has three distinct, real solutions,

if $D = 0$, the equation has three real solutions, with two being equal,

if $D > 0$, the equation has one real and two complex solutions.

As a consequence, we obtain

Proposition 3.5. *Let $p : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be the smooth submersion*

$$p(x, y) = x^3 + A(y)x^2 + B(y)x + C(y).$$

If the discriminant $D(y)$ of the equation $p(x, y) = 0$ is a polynomial *with* even *degree and with* positive *leader coefficient, then $p^{-1}\{0\}$ is connected.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of propositions 3.3, and 3.4, thus we give just the outline. Take $[c,d]$ such that $D(y) > 0$, $\forall y \notin [c,d]$. Prove first that $p^{-1}\{0\} \cap \big(\mathbb{R} \times [d,\infty)\big)$ and $p^{-1}\{0\} \cap \big(\mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, c]\big)$ are non empty connected sets. Then conclude these two sets connect each other by a curve in $[a,b] \times [c,d]$, where $[a,b]$ is given by Lemma 3.2.

□

4. The proof of Theorem 1.3

In order to prove Theorem 1.3, we shall use next corollary, which is an immediate consequence of the classification of homogeneous polynomials of degree 4 given in Theorem 2.6 of [5].

Corollary 4.1. *Any polynomial of degree exactly* 4 *can be transformed by means of a* linear change of variables *in one of the following.*

(I)	$p_3 + x^4 + 6\mu x^2y^2 + y^4,$	$\mu < -1/3,$
(II)	$p_3 + \alpha\left(x^4 + 6\mu x^2y^2 + y^4\right),$	$\alpha = \pm 1,\ \mu > -1/3,\ \mu \neq 1/3,$
(III)	$p_3 + x^4 + 6\mu x^2y^2 - y^4,$	$\mu \in \mathbb{R},$
(IV)	$p_3 + \alpha y^2\left(6x^2 + y^2\right),$	$\alpha = \pm 1,$
(V)	$p_3 + \alpha y^2\left(6x^2 - y^2\right),$	$\alpha = \pm 1,$
(VI)	$p_3 + \alpha\left(x^2 + y^2\right)^2,$	$\alpha = \pm 1,$
(VII)	$p_3 + 6\alpha x^2y^2,$	$\alpha = \pm 1,$
$(VIII)$	$p_3 + 4x^3y,$	
(IX)	$p_3 + \alpha x^4,$	$\alpha = \pm 1,$

where p_3 is a polynomial of degree less than or equal to 3.

We will work with the polynomials of Corollary 4.1 showing that each of them is not a submersion, or has all its level sets connected, or is equivalent (in the sense of Definition 1.2) to one of the cases of Theorem 1.3. We divide the 9 cases in 5 groups, each of them in one of the subsections bellow. Theorem 1.3 will be a direct consequence of the propositions 4.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.10 contained in the subsections 4.1, ..., 4.5, respectively.

The arguments use the results of sections 2 and 3. The calculations of the subresultants and of the discriminants were made using Maple.

To stablish notation, we write the polynomial p_3 in the following form

$$p_3 = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + a_{21}x^2y + a_{12}xy^2 + a_{03}y^3.$$

4.1. Cases (I), (II), (III) and (VI).

Proposition 4.2. *The polynomials of cases (I), (II), (III) and (VI) are not submersions.*

Next lemma will help us in the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. *The polynomials of cases (I), (II), (III) and (VI) are equivalent to*

$$p(x,y) = p_3(x,y) + x^4 + \gamma x^2y^2 + \theta y^4, \quad \text{with } \theta = \pm 1.$$

Moreover, if $\theta = 1$, then $\gamma \neq -2$.

Remark 1. *We remark that if $\theta = 1$ and $\gamma = -2$, then the change of coordinates $T(x, y) = (x - y, x + y)$ transforms $p(x, y)$ in case (VII).*

Proof. Polynomial (I) is counted above taking $\gamma = 6\mu$ and $\theta = 1$. Dividing polynomial (II) by α and taking $\gamma = 6\mu$, we have that it is also counted in the lemma, with $\theta = 1$. Now case (III) is counted above with $\gamma = 6\mu$ and $\theta = -1$. Finally, dividing polynomial (VI) by α, it is in the form of the lemma by taking $\gamma = 2$ and $\theta = 1$. □

Proof of Proposition 4.2. We will analyse the polynomial of Lemma 4.3.

Observe $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ have the forms $M(y)x^2 + a(y)x + b(y)$ and $N(y)x^3 + c(y)x^2 + d(y)x + e(y)$, respectively, with $N(y) \equiv 4$. With the notations of Theorem 2.4, observe

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, x\right) = b_0 + b_1 y + \cdots + b_8 y^8 + b_9 y^9,$$

with $b_9 = -64\theta(4\theta - \gamma^2)^2$. If $b_9 \neq 0$, this theorem gives that there exists a common zero of $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$. Therefore p is not a submersion. We suppose thus $b_9 = 0$, i.e. $\theta = 1$ and $\gamma = 2$. In this case we get $b_8 = 0$ and $b_7 = -576\left((a_{12} - a_{30})^2 + (a_{21} - a_{03})^2\right)$. Then by Theorem 2.4, if $a_{12} \neq a_{30}$ or $a_{21} \neq a_{03}$, p is not a submersion.

On the other hand, if $a_{30} = a_{12}$ and $a_{03} = a_{21}$, we have $b_6 = 0$ and $b_5 = -16\big((a_{12}^2 + 4a_{02} - 4a_{20} - a_{21}^2)^2 + 4(a_{12}a_{21} - 2a_{11})^2\big)$. If $b_5 \neq 0$, the same theorem guarantees that p is not a submersion.

Now if $b_5 = 0$, i.e. $a_{02} = -a_{12}^2/4 + a_{20} + a_{21}^2/4$ and $a_{11} = a_{12}a_{21}/2$, then $b_4 = 0$ and $b_3 = -\big((8a_{10} + a_{12}^3 - 4a_{20}a_{12})^2 + (a_{12}^2 a_{21} - 4a_{21}a_{20} + 8a_{01})^2\big)$. Then, as above, if $b_3 \neq 0$, p is not a submersion, whereas if $a_{10} = -a_{12}^3/8 + a_{20}a_{12}/2$ and $a_{01} = -a_{12}^2 a_{21}/8 + a_{20}a_{21}/2$, we get $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x, y) = -(a_{12} + 4x)\big(a_{12}^2 - 4a_{12}x - 8x^2 - 4a_{20} - 8y^2 - 4a_{21}y\big)/8$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, y) = -(a_{21} + 4y)\big(a_{12}^2 - 4a_{12}x - 8x^2 - 4a_{20} - 8y^2 - 4a_{21}y\big)/8$, which clearly have a common zero and so p is not a submersion. □

4.2. **Case (VIII).**

Proposition 4.4. *If a polynomial of case (VIII) is a submersion, it is equivalent to*

$$p = y + a_{02}y^2 + xy^3, \quad a_{02} = 0 \text{ or } 1.$$

In particular, the level set $p = 0$ is not connected.

To prove this proposition, we will first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5. *The polynomials of case (VIII) are equivalent to one of the following.*

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{12}xy^2 + a_{03}y^3 + x^3y, \quad a_{03}^2 + a_{12}^2 + a_{02}^2 > 0, \tag{4.1}$$

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + x^3y, \qquad 4a_{11}^3 + 27a_{01}^2 \neq 0 \tag{4.2}$$

$$p = a_{10}x + 2y + a_{20}x^2 - 3xy + x^3y, \tag{4.3}$$

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{20}x^2 + x^3y, \qquad a_{20} = 0 \text{ or } 1, \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. By multiplying the polynomial in case (VIII) by $1/4$, and after composing it with the change of coordinates $T(x, y) = \big(x + a_{21}/3, y + a_{30}\big)$, we obtain it is equivalent to (keeping the notations of the coefficients)

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{12}xy^2 + a_{03}y^3 + x^3y.$$

If $a_{03}^2+a_{12}^2+a_{02}^2>0$, we obtain case (4.1), whereas if these coefficients are zero, we could have $a_{01}^2+a_{11}^2$ zero or not. In the first case we get (4.4) (if $a_{20}\neq 0$, simply divide p by a_{20} and compose it with the change of coordinates $(x,y)\mapsto\big(x,y/a_{20}\big)$) and in the second case, if $4a_{11}^3+27a_{01}^2\neq 0$, we get case (4.2). On the other hand, if $4a_{11}^3+27a_{01}^2=0$, then $a_{01}\neq 0$ and the change $T(x,y)=\big(\sqrt[3]{2/a_{01}}x, a_{01}y/2\big)$ gives case (4.3). □

Proof of Proposition 4.4. For case (4.1) and (4.2) of Lemma 4.5, $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ have the forms $M(y)x^2+a(y)x+b(y)$ and $N(y)x^3+c(y)x^2+d(y)x+e(y)$, respectively, with $M(y)=3y$ and $N(y)=1$. Thus we are under the hypotheses of Theorem 2.4. Calculating the resultant we have

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x},\frac{\partial p}{\partial y},x\right)=b_0+b_1y+\cdots+b_7y^7.$$

In case (4.1), $b_7=-243a_{03}^2$. Thus if $a_{03}\neq 0$, p is not a submersion. On the other hand, if $a_{03}=0$, we have ($b_7=0$) and $b_6=-25a_{12}^3$. Then observe that

$$R_1\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x},\frac{\partial p}{\partial y},x\right)=4a_{20}^2-3a_{10}y+6a_{11}y^2+15a_{12}y^3.$$

Therefore if $a_{12}\neq 0$ and $a_{20}\neq 0$, we have a zero z of $R_1(y)$ with opposite signal with a_{12}. Then $b_6M(z)=-75a_{12}^3z>0$, and Corollary 2.6 guarantees that p is not a submersion.

On the other hand, if $a_{12}\neq 0$ and $a_{20}=0$, we have that $b_0=-a_{10}^3$. Suppose first $a_{10}\neq 0$. If a_{10} and a_{12} have opposite signals, then b_0 and b_6 have opposite signals and Theorem 2.4 gives that p is not a submersion. Now if a_{10} and a_{12} have the same signal, we observe $R_1(y)$ have a negative and a positive zero, which gives $b_6M(z)>0=-75a_{12}^3z>0$, for one of these zeros. This proves that p is not a submersion by Corollary 2.6. Now if $a_{10}=0$, we observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x,0)\equiv 0$, and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x,0)$ is a polynomial of degree 3. Thus, again, p is not a submersion.

If now $a_{12}=0$, then $a_{02}\neq 0$ and hence $b_5=-108a_{02}\neq 0$. Then Theorem 2.4 gives that p is not a submersion.

In the case (4.2), $b_7=b_6=b_5=b_4=0$ and $b_3=-\big(4a_{11}^3+27a_{01}^2\big)\neq 0$, which by Theorem 2.4 proves that p is not a submersion.

Now for the case (4.3), it is simple to observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(-2,y)\equiv 0$, and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(-2,y)$ is a polynomial of degree 1, hence p is not a submersion.

Finally, in the case (4.4), it is clear that if $a_{10}=0$ then p is not a submersion, whereas if $a_{10}\neq 0$, we multiply p by $1/a_{10}^2$ and apply the change $(x,y)\mapsto\big(a_{10}y,x/a_{10}\big)$ to get the polynomial map of the proposition. It is clear this is a submersion. □

4.3. **Case (IX).**

Proposition 4.6. *If the polynomial of the case (IX) is a submersion and has at least one disconnected level set, then it is equivalent to*

$$p=y+xy^2+y^4.$$

Lemma 4.7. *The polynomials in case (IX) are equivalent to one of the following.*

$$a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + a_{21}x^2y + a_{12}xy^2 + y^3 + x^4, \tag{4.5}$$

$$a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + a_{21}x^2y + a_{12}xy^2 + x^4, \quad a_{12} \neq 0, \text{ or } a_{12} = a_{21} = 0, \tag{4.6}$$

$$a_{10}x + a_{20}x^2 + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + x^2y + x^4, \quad a_{02} \neq 0, \tag{4.7}$$

$$a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{30}x^3 + x^2y + x^4, \quad a_{01} \neq 0, \tag{4.8}$$

$$a_{10}x + x^2y + x^4, \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. First we divide the polynomial of case (IX) by α. Then we get the case (4.5) above if $a_{03} \neq 0$ by composing p with $T(x, y) = \big(x, \sqrt[3]{a_{03}}y\big)$. If $a_{03} = 0$ and $a_{12} \neq 0$, we get the first part of case (4.6) above, whereas if $a_{03} = a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$, we obtain the second one. Now if $a_{03} = a_{12} = 0$ and $a_{21} \neq 0$, we take the transformation $T(x, y) = \big(x + a_{11}/(2a_{21}), a_{21}y\big)$ to obtain

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + x^2y + x^4.$$

Then, if $a_{02} \neq 0$, we apply $T(x, y) = \big(x, y + a_{01}/(2a_{02})\big)$ to obtain case (4.7). On the other hand, if $a_{02} = 0$ we obtain case (4.8) if $a_{01} \neq 0$ and, if $a_{01} = 0$, the transformation $T(x, y) = \big(x, y + a_{30}x + a_{20}\big)$ gives case (4.9). □

Proof of Proposition 4.6. The equation $p(x, y) - c = 0$, where p is the polynomial of case (4.5) of Lemma 4.7, has the form

$$y^3 + A(x)y^2 + B(x)y + C(x) = 0,$$

where $A(x) = a_{02} + a_{12}x$, $B(x) = a_{01} + a_{11}x + a_{21}x^2$ and $C(x) = a_{10}x + a_{20}x^2 + a_{30}x^3 + x^4 - c$. Calculating the discriminant of the equation as in Proposition 3.5, we obtain

$$D(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} b_i x^i, \qquad k = 8, \qquad b_8 = 1/4.$$

Thus by this proposition, we conclude that if p is a submersion, it has all its level sets connected.

Now we observe that in case (4.6) of Lemma 4.7,

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = M(y)x^2 + a(y)x + b(y), \qquad \frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = N(y)x^3 + c(y)x^2 + d(y)x + e(y), \tag{4.10}$$

with $N(y) = 4$, and $M(y) = a_{21}$ (which *can* be zero, for the firs part of this case and *is* zero for the second part). Then we calculate $R_0\big(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, x\big) = b_0 + b_1y + \cdots + b_5y^5$, and observe that $b_5 \neq 0$ if $a_{12} \neq 0$, which by Theorem 2.4 gives [3] that p is not a submersion. Now if $a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$, we have that $b_5 = b_4 = 0$ and $b_3 = -128a_{02}^3$. Therefore, if $a_{02} \neq 0$, the same theorem guarantees p is not a submersion. Finally, if $a_{02} = 0$, we have $b_2 = 0$ and $b_1 = 4a_{11}^4$. Then if $a_{11} \neq 0$, we also have p is not a submersion. If $a_{11} = 0$ and $a_{01} \neq 0$, it is simple to see the level sets of p are all connected, while if $a_{11} = a_{01} = 0$, it follows that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, y) \equiv 0$, and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x, y)$ annihilates for some x, since it has degree 3 in x.

Consider now case (4.7) of Lemma 4.7 and observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ have again the form of (4.10). We have $R_0\big(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, x\big) = b_0 + b_1y + b_2y^2 + b_3y^3$, with $b_3 =$

[3] Observe when $M \equiv 0$, we can yet apply this theorem.

$-8a_{02}(4a_{02}-1)^2$. If this is not zero, we obtain by Theorem 2.4 that p is not a submersion. If this is zero, i.e. $a_{02}=1/4$ (since $a_{02}\neq 0$), we obtain

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y},\frac{\partial p}{\partial x},x\right)=-\frac{9}{4}a_{30}^2y^2+(3a_{30}a_{10}-2a_{20}^2)y-a_{10}^2. \tag{4.11}$$

Moreover, equation $p(x,y)-c=0$ has the form of Proposition 3.3, with discriminant

$$\Delta(x)=-a_{30}x^3-a_{20}x^2-a_{10}x+c. \tag{4.12}$$

Thus if $a_{30}\neq 0$, Proposition 3.3 gives us that if p is a submersion, then all its level sets are connected. On the other hand, supposing $a_{30}=0$, if $a_{20}\neq 0$, (4.11) and Theorem 2.4 give us p is not a submersion. If $a_{20}=0$ and $a_{10}\neq 0$, (4.12) and Proposition 3.3 give us again that if p is a submersion, all its level sets are connected. Finally, if $a_{20}=a_{10}=0$, it is clear that $\nabla p(0,0)=0$.

Now we consider case (4.8). We have $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}=a_{10}+2a_{20}x+3a30x^2+4x^3+2xy$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}=a_{01}+x^2$. If $a_{01}<0$, it is clear that p is not a submersion. On the other hand, if $a_{01}>0$, we have that p is a submersion, but in this case $p(x,y)=c$ gives us $y=\left(c-a_{10}x-a_{20}x^2-a_{30}x^3-x^4\right)/\left(a_{01}+x^2\right)$, i.e. all the level sets of p are connected.

Finally, case (4.9) with $a_{10}=0$ is not a submersion, whereas if $a_{10}\neq 0$, we divide p by $\sqrt[3]{a_{10}^4}$ and then the change $(x,y)\mapsto\left(y/\sqrt[3]{a_{10}^2},x/\sqrt[3]{a_{10}}\right)$, gives the polynomial of the proposition. □

4.4. **Case (VII).**

Proposition 4.8. *If the polynomial of case (VII) is a submersion and has no all its level sets connected, it is equivalent to one of the following.*

$$\begin{aligned} p=&y+a_{02}y^2+y^3+x^2y^2, \qquad a_{02}^2-3<0,\\ p=&y+x^2y^2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.9. *The polynomials of case (VII) are equivalent to one of the following.*

$$p=a_{10}x+a_{01}y+a_{20}x^2+a_{11}xy+a_{02}y^2+x^3+y^3+x^2y^2, \tag{4.13}$$

$$p=a_{10}x+a_{01}y+a_{20}x^2+a_{11}xy+a_{02}y^2+y^3+x^2y^2, \tag{4.14}$$

$$p=a_{10}x+a_{01}y+a_{20}x^2+a_{11}xy+a_{02}y^2+x^2y^2,\quad |a_{02}|=1, \tag{4.15}$$

$$p=a_{10}x+a_{01}y+a_{11}xy+x^2y^2. \tag{4.16}$$

Proof. We first divide p by 6α. Then we compose it with the transformation $T(x,y)=\left(x+a_{12}/2,y+a_{21}/2\right)$ to get the following form

$$p=a_{10}x+a_{01}y+a_{20}x^2+a_{11}xy+a_{02}y^2+a_{30}x^3+a_{03}y^3+x^2y^2.$$

If $a_{03}a_{30}\neq 0$, we compose the polynomial with the transformation $T(x,y)=\left(x/\sqrt[3]{a_{30}a_{03}^2},y/\sqrt[3]{a_{30}^2a_{03}}\right)$ and multiply by $a_{30}^{-2}a_{03}^{-2}$ to get (4.13). If $a_{30}=0$ and $a_{03}\neq 0$, the transformation $T(x,y)=\left(x/\sqrt[3]{a_{03}},\sqrt[3]{a_{03}}y\right)$ takes p to (4.14). If $a_{30}\neq 0$ and $a_{03}=0$, we change x by y to get the case just studied.

If now $a_{30}=a_{03}=0$, and if $a_{02}\neq 0$, the change of coordinates $T(x,y)=\left(1/\sqrt{|a_{02}|}x,\sqrt{|a_{02}|}y\right)$ gives (4.15). If $a_{20}\neq 0$, change x by y to get the case just studied.

Thus we suppose $a_{30}=a_{03}=a_{20}=a_{02}=0$, to obtain case (4.16). □

Proof of Proposition 4.8. We will analyse each case of Lemma 4.9. For case (4.13), we notice that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ have the forms $M(x)y^2 + a(x)y + b(x)$ and $N(x)y^2 + c(x)y + d(x)$, respectively, with $M(x) = 2x$ and $N(x) = 3$. The subresultant is

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, y\right) = b_0 + \cdots + b_7x^7,$$

with $b_7 = -24$ and $b_0 = -3a_{11}^2a_{01} + 6a_{11}a_{10}a_{02} - 9a_{10}^2$. Thus by Theorem 2.5, $\nabla p(x, y)$ has a zero if $b_0 \neq 0$. Moreover, by the same theorem, if $b_0 = 0$ and $a_{11} = a(0) \neq 0$, we have again that $\nabla p(x, y)$ has a zero. Now if $b_0 = 0$ and $a_{11} = 0$, we obtain $a_{10} = 0$ and then $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x, y) = x\big(2a_{20} + 3x + 2y^2\big)$. Taking $x = -2\big(y^2 + a_{20}\big)/3$, we have $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = 0$, and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ is a polynomial of degree 5 in y. Hence p is not a submersion.

Now consider case (4.14) and observe that the equation $p(x, y) - c = 0$ is of the form $y^3 + A(x)y^2 + B(x)y + C(x)$, with the discriminant $\Delta(x)$ being a polynomial of degree 8 with leader coefficient $a_{20}/27$. If $a_{20} > 0$, Proposition 3.5 gives us that if p is a submersion, all its level sets are connected.

If $a_{20} \leq 0$, observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ have the forms $M(x)y^2 + a(x)y + b(x)$ and $N(x)y^2 + c(x)y + d(x)$, respectively, with $M(x) = 2x$ and $N(x) = 3$. Then we have

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, y\right) = b_0 + \cdots + b_5x^5 + b_6x^6, \tag{4.17}$$

with $b_6 = -16a_{20}$ and $b_0 = -3a_{11}^2a_{01} + 6a_{11}a_{10}a_{02} - 9a_{10}^2$, and

$$R_1\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, y\right) = -3a_{11} + 4a_{02}x + 4x^3.$$

We first suppose $a_{20} < 0$. Then if $b_0 \neq 0$ and $a_{11} \neq 0$, we have by Corollary 2.7, that $\nabla p(x, y)$ has a zero. If $b_0 \neq 0$ and $a_{11} = 0$, we get $b_0 = -9a_{10}^2 < 0$ and $b_6 > 0$, which by Theorem 2.5 gives a zero of ∇p. Now if $b_0 = 0$ and $a_{11} = a(0) \neq 0$, we have by the same theorem, that p is not a submersion, whereas if $a_{11} = 0$, then $a_{10} = 0$. Therefore, again by Theorem 2.5, if $c(0)^2 - 4N(0)d(0) = 4\big(a_{02}^2 - 3a_{01}\big) \geq 0$, we have a zero of ∇p. Thus let us suppose $a_{02}^2 - 3a_{01} < 0$. We observe that $y = -\sqrt{-a_{20}}$ annihilates $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x, y)$, and there exists x such that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x, y) = 2yx^2 + \big(3y^2 + 2a_{02}y + a_{01}\big) = 0$, by our last hypothesis.

Now if $a_{20} = 0$, then $b_6 = 0$ and $b_5 = -8a_{10}$. Thus if $a_{10} \neq 0$ and $b_0 \neq 0$, Theorem 2.5 gives a zero of ∇p. If yet $a_{10} \neq 0$ and $b_0 = 0$, the same theorem guarantees p is not a submersion, since in this case $a(0) = a_{11}$ has to be non zero. Now if $a_{10} = 0$, we see that $b_5 = b_4 = 0$ and $b_3 = -4a_{11}a_{01}$ and $b_0 = -3a_{11}^2a_{01}$. Therefore, if $a_{01}a_{11} \neq 0$, Theorem 2.5 guarantees that p is not a submersion. If $a_{01} = 0$, it is clear that $\nabla p(0, 0) = 0$, whereas if $a_{01} \neq 0$ and $a_{11} = 0$, we obtain that p is a submersion if and only if $a_{02}^2 - 3a_{01} < 0$. Then $a_{01} > 0$ and multiplying p by $1/\sqrt{a_{01}^3}$ and composing with the change $(x, y) \mapsto \big(x/\sqrt[4]{a_{01}}, y/\sqrt{a_{01}}\big)$, we get the first case of this proposition.

For case (4.15), $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = 0$ gives $y = -(a_{01} + a_{11}x)/\big(2(a_{02} + x^2)\big)$, and it follows that

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2(a_{02} + x^2)^2}q_5(x),$$

where $q_5 = b_0 + \cdots + b_5x^5$, with $b_5 = 4a_{20}$.

If $a_{20} \neq 0$ and $a_{02} = 1$, we get a zero of ∇p. If $a_{02} = -1$, we observe that $q_5(1) = (a_{01} + a_{11})^2$ and $q_5(-1) = -(a_{01} - a_{11})^2$. If $q_5(1)$ and $q_5(-1)$ are not zero, we have a zero of q_5 different from ± 1, and thus a zero of ∇p. If $q_5(1) = 0$, i.e. $a_{01} = -a_{11}$, we have

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = (x-1)\,(a_{11} + 2y + 2xy)\,. \tag{4.18}$$

Then if $a_{11} = 0$ it is simple to see that $\nabla p\,(-a_{10}/(2a_{20}), 0) = (0,0)$. On the other hand, if $a_{11} \neq 0$, (4.18) gives that $x = \big(-(a_{11}+2y)/(2y)\big)$ annihilates $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$, and

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x,y) = -\frac{y^3 + (2a_{20} + a_{10})y + a_{20}a_{11}}{y},$$

which clearly has a zero $y \neq 0$. Analogously, if $q_5(-1) = 0$, we obtain a zero of ∇p.

Thus we can suppose $a_{20} = 0$. Solving x in $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = 0$, we get $x = -(a_{10} + a_{11}y)/\left(2y^2\right)$, which substituting in $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ gives

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2y^3}\left(a_{10}^2 + a_{10}a_{11}y + 2a_{01}y^3 + 4a_{02}y^4\right).$$

If $a_{10} \neq 0$ and $a_{02} = -1$, we have a zero of ∇p. If $a_{10} \neq 0$ and $a_{02} = 1$, we consider the discriminant of $p(x,y) - c = a_{10}x - c + (a_{01} + a_{11}x)y + (1+x^2)y^2$ as in Proposition 3.3, and notice that it is a polynomial of degree 3 in x. Therefore, if p is a submersion, all its level sets are connected.

Now to finish this case, we suppose $a_{10} = 0$ and observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = (2xy + a_{11})y$. Then if $a_{11} \neq 0$, we have that $\nabla p\,(-a_{01}/a_{11}, 0) = (0,0)$. On the other hand if $a_{11} = 0$, we see that $\nabla p\,(0, -a_{01}/(2a_{02})) = (0,0)$ as well.

Finally, for case (4.16), we first observe that if p is a submersion, then changing x to y if necessary, we can suppose $a_{01} \neq 0$. Then $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = 0$ gives that $x = -\big(a_{10} + a_{11}y\big)/\big(2y^2\big)$ and hence $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y} = \big(2a_{01}y^3 + a_{11}a_{10}y + a_{10} + a_{10}^2\big)/(2y^3)$. Thus if $a_{10} \neq 0$, we get that ∇p has a zero. On the other hand, if $a_{10} = 0$, we get that $y = 0$ annihilates $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ and if $a_{11} \neq 0$, we have a zero of $\nabla p(x,0)$. Finally, if $a_{11} = 0$, the change of variables $(x,y) \mapsto \big(x/\sqrt{|a_{01}|}, a_{01}y\big)$ gives the second case of this proposition. □

4.5. **Cases (IV) and (V).**

Proposition 4.10. *If the polynomials of cases (IV) and (V) are submersions, then all its level sets are connected.*

Lemma 4.11. *The polynomials of cases (IV) and (V) are equivalent to one of the following*

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + y^3 + x^4 + a_{22}x^2y^2, \tag{4.19}$$

$$p = a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + x^4 + a_{22}x^2y^2, \tag{4.20}$$

with $a_{22} = \pm 1$.

Proof. Dividing polynomials of cases (IV) and (V) by α and $-\alpha$, respectively, and applying the transformation $T(x,y) = \big(y, \sqrt{6}x\big)$, we obtain they are equivalent to

$$a_{10}x + a_{01}y + a_{20}x^2 + a_{11}xy + a_{02}y^2 + a_{30}x^3 + a_{21}x^2y + a_{12}xy^2 + a_{03}y^3 + x^4 + a_{22}x^2y^2,$$

with $a_{22} = \pm 1$. Then we compose this with the transformation $T(x,y) = \big(x + a_{12}/(2a_{22}), y + a_{21}/(2a_{22})\big)$ to eliminate a_{12} and a_{21}. If $a_{03} \neq 0$, we compose the

result with $T(x,y) = \left(x/a_{03}, y/a_{03}\right)$ and by multiplying it by $1/a_{03}^4$ we obtain case (4.19). On the other hand, if $a_{03} = 0$, we get case (4.20). □

Proof of Proposition 4.10. Take case (4.19) of the lemma. Observe that for each $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $p(x,y) - c$ has the form $y^3 + A(x)y^2 + B(x)y + C(x)$ as in Proposition 3.5. Calculating the discriminant $D(x)$ we observe it is a polynomial of degree 10 with leader coefficient $a_{22}^3/27$. Thus if $a_{22} = 1$, we have that if p is a submersion, all its level sets are connected.

In case $a_{22} = -1$, we observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ have the forms $M(y)x^2 + a(y)x + b(y)$ and $N(y)x^3 + c(y)x^2 + d(y)x + e(y)$, respectively, with $M(y) = -2y$ and $N(y) = 4$. With the notations of Theorem 2.4,

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, x\right) = b_0 + b_1 y + \cdots + b_8 y^8,$$

with $b_8 = -48$, and

$$R_1\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, x\right) = 4a_{11}^2 + (8a_{01} + 6a_{30}a_{11})y + (16a_{02} + 8a_{20})y^2 + 24y^3 - 8y^4.$$

If $a_{11} \neq 0$, there exist $z > 0$ such that $R_1(z) = 0$. Thus $b_8 M(z) = 96z > 0$, and Corollary 2.6, gives us p is not a submersion. Now if $a_{11} = 0$, we observe that $b_0 = -16a_{01}^3$. If $a_{01} < 0$, there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $b_8 R_0(z) < 0$, which by Theorem 2.4, guarantees p is not a submersion. On the other hand, if $a_{01} > 0$, there exists $z > 0$ such that $R_1(z) = 0$ and $b_8 M(z) > 0$, which again by Corollary 2.6 guarantees that p is not a submersion. Finally, if $a_{01} = 0$, we see that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}(x,0) \equiv 0$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}(x,0)$ is a polynomial of degree 3, which always has a zero.

Now in the case (4.20), $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ also have their forms as in Theorem 2.4, with $M(y) = 2a_{22}y$ and $N(y) = 4$. Here $R_0(y) = b_0 + \cdots + b_6 y^6 + b_7 y^7$, with $b_7 = -32a_{22}^4 a_{02}$. Thus by Theorem 2.4, p is not a submersion if $a_{02} \neq 0$.

On the other hand, if $a_{02} = 0$, we divide the analysis in two cases: $a_{22} = 1$ and $a_{22} = -1$. In the first case, if $a_{01} = 0$, $y = -a_{11}/(2x)$ annihilates $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and transforms $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x} = 0$ in an equation of degree 3 in x with constant term $a_{10} \neq 0$ (otherwise $\nabla p(0,0) = (0,0)$). Thus we get a zero of ∇p. If $a_{01} \neq 0$, we observe that $p(x,y) - c$ has the form

$$A(x)y^2 + B(x)y + C(x),$$

with $A(x) = x^2$, $B(x) = a_{01} + a_{11}x$ and $C(x) = -c + a_{10}x + a_{20}x^2 + a_{30}x^3 + x^4$. If $x = 0$, there is exactly one y such that $p(0,y) = 0$. Moreover, the discriminant $\Delta(x)$ is a polynomial of degree 6 with leader coefficient -4. Therefore, we are under the hypotheses of Proposition 3.4, and hence if p is a submersion, all its level sets are connected.

Finally, in the second case, i.e. $a_{22} = -1$, we observe that $\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}$ and $\frac{\partial p}{\partial x}$ are as in Theorem 2.4, with $M(y) = -2y$ and $N(y) = 4$, and

$$R_0\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, x\right) = b_0 + b_1 y + \cdots + b_6 y^6,$$

with $b_6 = -16a_{01}$, and

$$R_1\left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial p}{\partial x}, x\right) = 4a_{11}^2 + (8a_{01} + 6a_{11}a_{30})\, y + 8a_{20}y^2 - 8y^4.$$

Then, if $a_{01} \neq 0$ and $a_{11} \neq 0$, we have by Corollary 2.6 that p is not a submersion. If $a_{01} \neq 0$ and $a_{11} = 0$, we also get by this corollary that p is not a submersion. On the other hand, if $a_{01} = a_{11} = 0$, it is simple to conclude that ∇p has a zero. □

5. The polynomials of Theorem 1.3

Let $M \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open set and $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth submersion. We denote by $\mathscr{F}(f)$ the foliation of M given by the connected components of the level sets of f (Lemma 3.1). We recall the concept of half-Reeb component.

Definition 5.1. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth submersion, $h_0 : \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $h_0(x, y) = xy$, and

$$B = \{(x, y) \in [0, 2] \times [0, 2] \mid 0 < x + y \leq 2\}.$$

We say that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a *half-Reeb component*, or simply a *hRc*, of $\mathscr{F}(f)$ if there is a homeomorphism $T : B \to \mathcal{A}$ which is a topological equivalence between $\mathscr{F}(h_0)|_B$ and $\mathscr{F}(f)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ with the following properties:

(1) The segment $\{(x, y) \in B \mid x+y = 2\}$ is sent by T onto a transversal section to the leaves of $\mathscr{F}(f)$ in the complement of $T(1, 1)$. This section is called the *compact edge* of $\mathcal{A}$.
(2) Both the segments $\{(x, y) \in B \mid x = 0\}$ and $\{(x, y) \in B \mid y = 0\}$ are sent by T onto full half leaves of $\mathscr{F}(f)$, called the *non-compact edges* of $\mathcal{A}$.



Figure 1. Definition of hRc

The existence of hRc is equivalent to the existence of inseparable leaves on the foliation $\mathscr{F}(f)$ (see [7] for details). Moreover, the following proposition of [2] relates this definition to connectedness of level sets.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth submersion. Then $\mathscr{F}(f)$ has a hRc if and only if there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f^{-1}\{c\}$ is not connected.*

A particular version of the following result is already contained in [2]. The proof in the general case is a simple extension of that and we add it here for completeness.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth submersion, $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a hRc of $\mathscr{F}(f)$ and U be a neighbourhood of $\mathcal{A}$. If $h : U \to [0, \infty)$ is a measurable function such that*

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty,$$

then there is not a differentiable $g : U \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\det D(f, g) = h$ at U.

Proof. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \to \mathcal{A}$ be an injective curve that parametrize the compact edge of $\mathcal{A}$. For n big enough, the leaf of $\mathscr{F}(f)$ through $\gamma(1/n)$ cuts γ in $\gamma(t_n)$, with $t_n > 1/n$. We denote by β_n the interval of this leaf between $\gamma(1/n)$ and $\gamma(t_n)$, and by γ_n the interval of γ between this two points. We denote yet by B_n the compact region bounded by γ_n and β_n. By the Monotone Convergence Theorem,

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{B_n} h. \tag{5.1}$$

If there is g such that $h = \det D(f, g)$ in U, Green's Theorem gives

$$\int_{B_n} h = \int_{\gamma_n} -g\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}dx + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}dy\right) \leq \int_{\gamma} -g\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}dx + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}dy\right),$$

since β_n is orthogonal to ∇f. Thus $\int_{B_n} h$ is uniformly bounded, a contradiction with (5.1) and $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty$. □

We shall also need the following simple lemma (a reduced version of it was already used in [2]).

Lemma 5.4. *Let $b_1, b_2 > 0$, and $\phi_1 : (0, b_1) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_2 : (b_2, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t) = \sum_{j=k_1}^{k_2} c_j t^j$, where $k_1 \leq k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and c_{k_1}, $c_{k_2} \neq 0$. If $\phi_i(t) > 0$, for all t in the domain of ϕ_i, then*

1. *$c_{k_i} > 0$, for $i = 1, 2$.*
2. *If $k_1 \leq -1$, then $\int_0^{b_1} \phi_1(t)dt = \infty$.*
3. *If $k_2 \geq -1$, then $\int_{b_2}^{\infty} \phi_2(t)dt = \infty$.*

Proof. If we multiply $\phi_i(t)$ by t^{-k_i}, hypothesis in 1 gives that $\sum_{j=k_1}^{k_2} c_j t^{j-k_i} > 0$, for all t in the domain of ϕ_i. Taking $t \to 0$, if $i = 1$ or $t \to \infty$, if $i = 2$, it follows that $c_{k_i} > 0$, proving 1. The proof of 2 and 3 follows by Hölder's inequality: defining $I_1 = (0, b_1)$ and $I_2 = (b_2, \infty)$, we get that $b_i^{-1-k_i} \int_{I_i} \phi_i(t)dt \geq \int_{I_i} t^{-1-k_i}\phi_i(t)dt = \infty$, since for both $i = 1, 2$, the last integral is $\int_{I_i} c_{k_i} t^{-1}dt$ plus the integral of a $L^1(I_i)$ function. □

We now apply these results to analyse each polynomial of Theorem 1.3 in each of the subsections bellow. As a consequence, we will obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 5.5. *If $p(x, y)$ is one of the polynomials of Theorem 1.3, then there is not a polynomial $q(x, y)$ such that $\det D(p, q)(x, y) > 0$, $\forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.*

5.1. **Case 1.** We consider the polynomial $p(x, y) = y + xy^2 + y^4 = y(1 + xy + y^3)$. It is simple to observe that the following set is a hRc of $\mathscr{F}(p)$:

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -1 \leq y < 0 \text{ and } 0 \leq x \leq -1/y - y^2\right\} \cup \{(0, x) \mid x \geq 0\}.$$

We claim that given a polynomial $h(x, y) = \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}x^i y^j$ such that $h(x, y) > 0$, $\forall (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, then $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty$. Thus by Proposition 5.3, there is not a polynomial $q(x, y)$ such that $\det D(p, q)(x, y) > 0$.

To prove the claim, we define

$$\tau = \min\{j - i - 1 \mid 0 \leq i + j \leq k \text{ and } b_{ij} \neq 0\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Applying the change of variables $(x, y) \mapsto \left(-xy/(1+y^3), -y\right)$ in the interior of $\mathcal{A}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{A}} h &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}(-1)^j x^i y^{j-i-1} \left(1-y^3\right)^{i+1} dxdy \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left(s(x)y^\tau + s_1(x)y^{\tau+1} + \cdots\right) dydx, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where

$$s(x) = \sum_{\substack{i+j\leq k \\ j-i-1=\tau}} b_{ij}(-1)^j x^i,$$

and $s_1(x), s_2(x), \ldots$ are suitable polynomials in x.

By (5.2), the polynomial $s(x)$ is not identically zero, hence there exists a $0 < c \leq 1$ such that $s(x) \neq 0$, $\forall x \in (0, c)$. Since $h(x, y) > 0$, for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, it follows by Lemma 5.4 that $s(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (0, c)$. Moreover, as $b_{00} \neq 0$, we have that $\tau < 0$ and thus, by applying Lemma 5.4 once more, it follows that, for each $x \in (0, c)$,

$$\int_0^1 \left(s(x)y^\tau + s_1(x)y^{\tau+1} + \cdots\right) dy = \infty.$$

Then

$$\int_0^c \int_0^1 \left(s(x)y^\tau + s_1(x)y^{\tau+1} + \cdots\right) dydx = \infty,$$

which by (5.3) gives that $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty$, and the claim is proven.

5.2. **Case 2.** We consider the quite analogous case of the polynomial $p(x, y) = y + a_{02}y^2 + xy^3$, with $a_{02} = 0$ or 1. We observe that the closure of the following set is a hRc of $\mathscr{F}(p)$.

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -1 \leq y < 0 \text{ and } -1/y^2 - a_{02}/y \leq x \leq a_{02} - 1\right\}.$$

We claim that given a positive polynomial $h(x, y)$, then $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty$. As above, this will show there is not a polynomial q such that $\det D(p, q) > 0$.

The proof of this claim is similar to the one made above: by defining $\tau = \min\{j - 2i - 2 \mid b_{ij} \neq 0\}$ and taking the bounded set $B = \{(x, y) \mid -1 \leq y < 0 \text{ and } a_{02} - 1 \leq x \leq 0\}$, we get[4]

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}\cup B} h = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}(-1)^{i+j} x^i y^{j-2i-2} \left(1 - a_{02}y\right)^{i+1} dydx.$$

Then since $\tau < 0$, we get as before that $\int_{\mathcal{A}\cup B} h = \infty$, hence $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty$, proving the claim.

[4]Apply the change of variables $(x, y) \mapsto \left(-xy^2/(1 + a_{02}y), -y\right)$.

5.3. **Case 3.** We consider now the polynomial $p(x,y) = y + x^2y^2$. This is quite different from the former ones. We first observe that the following set is a hRc of $\mathscr{F}(p)$.

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq 1 \text{ and } -1/x^2 \leq y \leq 0\right\}.$$

Then $\int_{\mathcal{A}} 1 = -\int_1^\infty 1/x^2 dx < \infty$, and thus Proposition 5.3 can not be used to prove that there is not a polynomial q such that $\det D(p,q) = 1$, for example. But we will use this proposition to eliminate candidates to be the polynomial q. Then we will use a different argument to show that there is not such a polynomial.

Let us suppose there exist $q(x,y) = \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}x^iy^j$ such that

$$h(x,y) = \det D(p,q)(x,y) = \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}\left(2(j-i)x^{i+1}y^{j+1} - ix^{i-1}y^j\right) > 0,$$

for all $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. We define

$$\tau = \max\left\{i - 2j - 3 \mid 0 \leq i+j \leq k \text{ and } b_{ij} \neq 0\right\},$$

and *we claim that* $\tau < -1$. Indeed, calculating $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h$ by applying the change of variables $(x,y) \mapsto (x, -x^2y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{A}} h &= \int_0^1 \int_1^\infty \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}(-1)^{j+1}\big(2(j-i)y + i\big)y^j x^{i-2j-3} dxdy \\ &= \int_0^1 \int_1^\infty \left(s(y)x^\tau + s_1(y)x^{\tau-1} + \cdots\right) dxdy,\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$s(y) = \sum_{\substack{i+j\leq k \\ i-2j-3=\tau}} b_{ij}(-1)^{j+1}\left(2(j-i)y + i\right)y^j$$

and $s_i(y)$ are suitable polynomials in y. If $\tau \geq -1$, we have that $s(y)$ is not identically zero and thus there exists $c \leq 1$ such that $s(y) \neq 0$ in $(0,c)$. Moreover, since $h(x,y)$ is a positive polynomial, it follows by Lemma 5.4 that $s(y) > 0$ in $(0,c)$. By the same lemma, it follows that the above integral is infinite. But this contradicts Proposition 5.3 (since we are supposing there exists q such that $\det D(p,q) = h$). Hence the claim is proven.

Now since we are supposing $h(x,y) > 0$, for all $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, considering $y = \theta x^{-2}$ we have that

$$\sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}\big(2(j-i)\theta - i\big)\theta^j x^{i-2j-1} > 0$$

for all $x, \theta \in \mathbb{R}$, with $x \neq 0$. Since $b_{ij} = 0$ for $i - 2j - 1 > 0$ (as $\tau < -1$), we have that

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{\substack{i+j\leq k \\ i-2j-1=0}} b_{ij}\big(2(j-i)\theta - i\big)\theta^j \geq 0, \tag{5.5}$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then by Lemma 5.6 bellow, it follows that $L(\theta)$ is identically zero, which guarantees in particular that $b_{10} = 0$. But this is a contradiction with $-b_{10} = h(0,0) > 0$. Hence we conclude there is not a polynomial $q(x,y)$ such that $\det D(p,q)(x,y) > 0$, for all $(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

5.4. **Case 4.** Finally, we consider $p(x,y) = y + a_{02}y^2 + y^3 + x^2y^2$, with $a_{02}^2 < 3$. We shall use the notations of Subsection 5.3. We first observe that the closure of

$$\mathcal{A} = \Big\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \ -1 \leq y < 0 \text{ and } \sqrt{2-a_{02}} \leq x \leq \sqrt{-1/y - a_{02} - y}\Big\}$$

is a half-Reeb component of $\mathscr{F}(p)$. Given $m < 1$, since the inequality $m^2 < 1 + a_{02}y + y^2$ is valid for all $y \in (b,0)$, for some $b \geq -1$, we have that

$$m\sqrt{-1/y} < \sqrt{-1/y - a_{02} - y}, \quad \forall y \in (b,0). \tag{5.6}$$

We suppose also that $b \geq -m^2$ and define

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} = \Big\{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \geq m/\sqrt{-b} \ \text{ and } \ -m^2/x^2 \leq y < 0\Big\}.$$

Now if $(x,y) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}$, then $b \leq y < 0$ and $m/\sqrt{-b} \leq x \leq m\sqrt{-1/y}$. Hence by (5.6), we have that $(x,y) \in \mathcal{A} \cup C$, where C is the bounded set $C = \big\{ -1 \leq y < 0 \text{ and } 1 \leq x \leq \sqrt{2-a_{02}}\big\}$, if $1 \leq \sqrt{2-a_{02}}$, or $C = \emptyset$. Thus $\int_{\mathcal{A}\cup C} h \geq \int_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} h$, for all positive function h defined in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and hence $\int_{\mathcal{A}} h = \infty$ if $\int_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} h = \infty$.

As in the preceding subsection, we suppose there is a polynomial $q(x,y) = \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}x^iy^j$ such that $h(x,y) = \det D(p,q)(x,y) > 0$, $\forall (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then we define $\tau = \max\{i - 2j - 3 \mid b_{ij} \neq 0\}$ and *we claim that* $\tau < -1$. Indeed calculating $\int_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} h$ by applying the change of variables $(x,y) \mapsto \big(x, -x^2y\big)$, we get that

$$\int_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} h = \int_0^{m^2} \int_{\frac{m}{\sqrt{-b}}}^{\infty} \sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}(-1)^{j+1}\big((2(j-i)y + i)\, x^{i-2j-3}y^j + r_{ij}(x,y)\big)dxdy,$$

where $r_{ij}(x,y) = 3ix^{i-2j-7}y^{j+2} - 2a_{02}ix^{i-2j-5}y^{j+1}$. As in Subsection 5.3, it follows that if $\tau \geq -1$, this integral is infinite, which is a contradiction with Proposition 5.3, and the claim is proven.

By considering again $y = \theta x^{-2}$, we have that

$$\sum_{i+j\leq k} b_{ij}\big((2(j-i)\theta - i)\theta^j x^{i-2j-1} - 2a_{02}\theta^{j+1}x^{i-2j-3} - 3i\theta^{j+2}x^{i-2j-5}\big) > 0,$$

for all $\theta, x \in \mathbb{R}$, with $x \neq 0$. Since $\tau < -1$, it follows in particular that the polynomial $L(\theta)$ defined in (5.5) is such that $L(\theta) \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.6 bellow, we get that $L(\theta)$ is identically zero, hence $b_{10} = 0$, which is a contradiction with $-b_{10} = h(0,0) > 0$. Thus we conclude that there is not a polynomial q such that $\det D(p,q) > 0$.

Lemma 5.6. *Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b_0, \ldots, b_N \in \mathbb{R}$, let $L(\theta)$ be the polynomial*

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} b_j\big(2(j+1)\theta + 2j + 1\big)\theta^j.$$

Then $L(\theta)$ is the zero polynomial or there exist $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L(\theta_1) < 0 < L(\theta_2)$.

See the appendix for the proof of Lemma 5.6.

6. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Suppose we are under the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1. If all the level sets of p are connected or the degree of p is less than or equal to 3, then F is injective by the argument given in introduction or by the main result of [2], respectively. Thus we can suppose that p has least one disconnected level set and that the degree of p is 4.

By Theorem 1.3, there exist $M, N \in \mathbb{R}$, $M \neq 0$, and an affine change of coordinates T such that $\overline{p} = Mp \circ T^{-1} + N$ is one of the polynomials of this theorem. If we take $M' = \operatorname{signal}(\det DF) \det T^{-1} M$ and $\overline{q} = M'p \circ T^{-1}$, we have that $\det D(\overline{p}, \overline{q}) = MM' \det DF \det T^{-1} > 0$, a contradiction with Theorem 5.5.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 5.6

From now on, we consider the following convention: given $P : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\prod_{l=m}^{n} P(l) = 1, \qquad \sum_{l=m}^{n} P(l) = 0,$$

if $n < m$. We also denote by $\det A$ the determinant of a quadratic matrix A.

Lemma A.1. *Let $k \geq j \geq 1$ and $i \geq -1$ be integers. Define*

$$\alpha_i^k = (-2)^{i+1} \prod_{l=0}^{i} \frac{2k-l}{4k-(2l+1)},$$

and the $(j+1) \times (j+1)$ matrix

$$H_j^k = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{2j-1}^k & \alpha_{2j-2}^k & \cdots & \alpha_j^k & \alpha_{j-1}^k \\ \alpha_{2j-2}^k & \alpha_{2j-3}^k & \cdots & \alpha_{j-1}^k & \alpha_{j-2}^k \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \alpha_j^k & \alpha_{j-1}^k & \cdots & \alpha_1^k & \alpha_0^k \\ \alpha_{j-1}^k & \alpha_{j-2}^k & \cdots & \alpha_0^k & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the determinant of H_j^k is positive.

Proof. For each integer $l = 0, \ldots, 2j-1$, denote

$$m_l = 2k - l, \qquad n_l = 4k - (2l+1).$$

Denote also $(h_{r,s})_{m \times n}$ the $m \times n$ matrix whose element in the rth row and sth column is $h_{r,s}$. Then $H_j^k = (h_{r,s})_{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} h_{r,s} = \alpha_{2j-r-s+1}^k &= (-2)^{2j-r-s+2} \prod_{l=0}^{2j-r-s+1} \frac{m_l}{n_l} \\ &= (-2)^{j-r+1}(-2)^{j-s+1} \prod_{l=0}^{j-s} \frac{m_l}{n_l} \prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-r-s+1} m_l \prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-s} \frac{1}{n_l} \prod_{l=2j-r-s+2}^{2j-s} n_l. \end{aligned}$$

For each r, divide the row r by $(-2)^{j-r+1}$ and for each s, divide the column s by the factors above depending only on s. After that, we obtain that $\det H_j^k =$

$M \det(a_{r,s})_{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$, where

$$M = \prod_{r=1}^{j+1}(-2)^{j-r+1}\prod_{s=1}^{j+1}\left((-2)^{j-s+1}\prod_{l=0}^{j-s}\frac{m_l}{n_l}\prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-s}\frac{1}{n_l}\right)$$

and

$$a_{r,s} = \prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-r-s+1} m_l \prod_{l=2j-r-s+2}^{2j-s} n_l.$$

Since $1 \leq j \leq k$, we have that $m_l, n_l > 0$ and it follows that M is positive. Thus it is enough to prove that $\det(a_{r,s})_{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$ is positive.

To prove this we will make operations with the rows and the columns of the matrix.

We first operate the rows. We denote $a^0_{r,s} = a_{r,s}$ for each r, s. Then for each $t = 1, \ldots, j$, we consider $b = t+1, \ldots, j+1$ and replace the row b by this row minus two times the row $b-1$ and denote by $a^t_{r,s}$ the elements of this new matrix. That is, for each t,

$$a^t_{r,s} = \begin{cases} a^{t-1}_{r,s} - 2a^{t-1}_{r-1,s}, & r > t \\ a^{t-1}_{r,s}, & r \leq t. \end{cases}$$

It is not difficult to prove by induction on t that

$$a^t_{r,s} = \prod_{l=0}^{t-1}(-2l-1)\prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-s-r+1} m_l \prod_{l=2j-s-r+(t+2)}^{2j-s} n_l, \qquad r > t.$$

In the last step $t = j$, we obtain the matrix $\left(a^j_{r,s}\right)_{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$, with

$$a^j_{r,s} = a^{r-1}_{r,s} = \prod_{l=0}^{r-2}(-2l-1)\prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-s-r+1} m_l$$

since the products of the n_l are equal to 1 when $t = r-1$.

We now operate the columns of this modified matrix. Denoting again $a_{r,s} = a^j_{r,s}$, for each $t = 1, \ldots, j$ and for each $b = 1, \ldots, j+1-t$, replace the column b by the column b minus the column $b+1$. Denoting by $a^t_{r,s}$ the elements of this new matrix, we have

$$a^t_{r,s} = \begin{cases} a^{t-1}_{r,s} - a^{t-1}_{r,s+1}, & s \leq j+1-t \\ a^{t-1}_{r,s}, & s > j+1-t. \end{cases}$$

It is not difficult to show by induction on t that

$$a^t_{r,s} = \prod_{l=1}^{t}(r-j+(l-2))\prod_{l=0}^{r-2}(-2l-1)\prod_{l=j-s+1}^{2j-s-r-(t-1)} m_l, \qquad s \leq j+1-t.$$

In the last step $t = j$, we have the matrix $\left(a^j_{r,s}\right)_{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$, with

$$a^j_{r,s} = a^{j+1-s}_{r,s} = \prod_{l=1}^{j+1-s}(l-(j-r+1)-1)\prod_{l=0}^{r-2}(-2l-1)\prod_{l=j+1-s}^{j-r} m_l.$$

If $r > s$, $l = j - r + 2$ will annihilate the product on the first factor of $a^j_{r,s}$ and hence $\left(a^j_{r,s}\right)_{(j+1)\times(j+1)}$ is a triangular matrix. Moreover, if $s = r$, we have

$$a^j_{r,r} = \prod_{l=1}^{j+1-r} (l - (j+1-r) - 1) \prod_{l=0}^{r-2} (-2l-1),$$

which is the product of j *negative* factors. Thus $\prod_{r=1}^{j+1} a^j_{r,r}$ is the product of $j(j+1)$ negative factors. Hence $\det H^k_j$ is positive. □

Corollary A.2. *The matrix of Lemma A.1 has all its leading principal minors positive.*

Proof. Given $i \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$, it is simple to see that

$$\alpha^k_i = \alpha^k_1 \alpha^{k-1}_{i-2}.$$

Since $\alpha^r_1 > 0$, for all $r \geq 1$, we have that the leading principal minors of H^k_j are positive multiples of $\det H^{k'}_{j'}$, with $j' \leq k'$, which are positive by Lemma A.1.

□

Proof of Lemma 5.6. If $L(\theta)$ is a positive polynomial, i.e. $L(\theta) \geq 0$, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, then the degree of L is even, say $N = 2k - 1$. Besides it is well known that there are polynomials

$$g(\theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} a_j \theta^j, \qquad h(\theta) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} c_j \theta^j$$

such that

$$L = g^2 + h^2. \tag{A.1}$$

That is,

$$b_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{2k-1} \Big(2jb_{j-1} + (2j+1)b_j\Big)\theta^j + 4kb_{2k-1}\theta^{2k} = \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \left(\sum_{r+s=j} a_r a_s + c_r c_s \right) \theta^j. \tag{A.2}$$

It follows from (A.2) that

$$b_0 = a_0^2 + c_0^2, \tag{A.3}$$

$$2jb_{j-1} + (2j+1)b_j = \sum_{r+s=j} a_r a_s + c_r c_s, \quad j = 1, .., 2k-1, \tag{A.4}$$

and

$$4kb_{2k-1} = a_k^2 + c_k^2. \tag{A.5}$$

We assert that if we use only (A.3) *and* (A.4)*, then for each* $j = 0, \ldots, 2k-1$*,*

$$b_j = \frac{1}{j+1} \sum_{l=0}^{j} (-2)^l \prod_{i=0}^{l} \frac{j-(i-1)}{2(j-i)+1} \sum_{r+s=j-l} a_r a_s + c_r c_s. \tag{A.6}$$

Indeed, (A.3) shows (A.6) for $j = 0$. We assume A.6 is true for j. Using (A.4) to write b_{j+1} in terms of b_j, after elementary and long calculations we can prove that (A.6) is true for $j + 1$, and the assertion is proven.

Denoting $a = (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ and $c = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_k)$, we define $K(a,c) = -4kb_{2k-1} + a_k^2 + c_k^2$. By (A.5), $K(a,c) = 0$, whereas by (A.6),

$$K(a,c) = \sum_{l=0}^{2k-1} (-2)^{l+1} \prod_{i=0}^{l} \frac{2k-i}{4k-(2i+1)} \sum_{r+s=2k-1-l} (a_r a_s + c_r c_s) + a_k^2 + c_k^2.$$

Now considering (a,c) as variables in $\mathbb{R}^{2(k+1)}$, last equation shows that $K(a,c)$ is a quadratic form in $\mathbb{R}^{2(k+1)}$. *We assert that $K(a,c)$ is a positive definite quadratic form.* This guarantees that $(a,c) = (0,0)$ provided that $K(a,c) = 0$. Thus g and h are identically zero, and by (A.1), L is identically zero. Therefore if $L(\theta) \neq 0$, we have shown that there exists θ_1 such that $L(\theta_1) < 0$. To conclude the proof, we just apply this result to the polynomial $-L(\theta)$.

In order to show the assertion, we first observe that it is enough to prove that $K(a,0)$ is positive definite, since $K(a,c) = K(a,0) + K(0,c)$ and $K(a,0) = K(0,a)$. Now to verify that $K(a,0)$ is positive definite, we shall show that $\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Hess}(K)$, where $\mathrm{Hess}(K) = \left(\partial^2 K/\partial a_i \partial a_j\right)_{(k+1)\times(k+1)}$ is the Hessian matrix of K, has all its leading principal minors positive. It is simple to show that for each $r, s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial a_r \partial a_s} = (-2)^{2k-r-s} \prod_{l=0}^{2k-r-s-1} \frac{2k-l}{4k-(2l+1)}.$$

If we denote

$$\alpha_i^k = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 K}{\partial a_r \partial a_s},$$

with $r+s = 2k-i-1$, then $\frac{1}{2}Hess(K) = H_k^k$, where H_k^k is the matrix of Lemma A.1 with $j = k$. Thus by Corollary A.2, all the leading principal minors of $\frac{1}{2}Hess(K)$ are positive.

□

References

[1] Bôcher, M.: Introduction to higher Algebra. Macmillan Co., New York (1907)

[2] Braun, F., dos Santos Filho, J. R.: The real jacobian conjecture on $\mathbb{R}^2$ is true when one of the components has degree 3. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 26, 75–87 (2010)

[3] Białynicki-Birula, A., Rosenlicht, M.: Injective morphisms of real algebraic varieties. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 13, 200–203 (1962)

[4] Camacho, C., Lins Neto, A.: Geometric theory of foliations, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston (1985)

[5] Cima, A., Llibre, J.: Algebraic and topological classification of the homogeneous cubic vector fields in the plane. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 147, 420–448 (1990)

[6] van den Essen, A.: Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian conjecture. Progress in Mathematics 190. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, (2000)

[7] Gutierrez, C., Jarque, X., Llibre, J., Teixeira, M. A.: Global injectivity of C^1 maps of the real plane, inseparable leaves and the Palais-Smale condition. Canad. Math. Bull. 50, 377–389 (2007)

[8] Gwoździewicz, J.: The real Jacobian conjecture for polynomials of degree 3. Ann. Polon. Math. 76, 121–125 (2001)

[9] Keller, O-H.: Ganze Cremona–Transformationen. Monatsh. Math. Phys. 47, 299–306 (1939)

[10] Pinchuk, S.: A counterexample to the strong real Jacobian conjecture. Math. Z. 217, 1–4 (1994)

(F. Braun and B. Oréfice-Okamoto) Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de São Carlos
Rod. Washington Luís, Km 235 - C.P. 676 - 13565-905 São Carlos, SP - Brasil

E-mail address, F. Braun: franciscobraun@dm.ufscar.br
E-mail address, B. Oréfice-Okamoto: bruna@dm.ufscar.br